UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/46/PV.68
23 December 1991

ENGLISH

Forty-sixth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 68th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 11 December 1991, at 10 a.m.

President:	Mr. SHIHABI	(Saudi Arabia)
later:	Mr. TRAXLER (Vice-President)	(Italy)

- Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council [38]

- Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Fourth Committee [99]

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

91-61989 7902V (E)

- Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa: report of the Fourth Committee [100]

- Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations: report of the Economic and Social Council: report of the Fourth Committee [101 and 12] (continued)

- Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Fourth Committee [103]

- Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the fourth Committee [19] (continued)

- Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the fourth Committee [19] (continued)

  (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

  (b) Reports of the Secretary-General

  (c) Draft resolutions

  (d) Report of the Fifth Committee

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 38

QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): Agenda item 38, entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council", was first considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session - on 14 December 1979 - at the initiative of Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Guyana, Maldives, Nepal, Nigeria, Sri Lanka and India. Most of these countries, joined by Cuba, Grenada, Iraq, Japan, Mauritius and Syria, submitted a draft resolution proposing an increase in the non-permanent membership of the Security Council from 10 to 14, along with some consequential changes. The proposal and the concept behind it were received with broad support across the Organization's membership. However, since an agreement on certain specifics could not be reached within the time available, and because the sponsors were keen to secure the widest possible support and avoid any sense of confrontation, they agreed to postpone the consideration of the item.

At the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, after further consultations the proposal was modified and submitted in the form of a new draft resolution calling for an increase in the Security Council membership to a total of 21 by adding six non-permanent seats. The draft resolution was sponsored by Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Cameroon, Cuba, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Iraq, Kenya, Libya, Nepal, Nigeria, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Zaire, Zambia and India. In addition, the draft resolution had the endorsement of the African Group as a whole. Again, for reasons similar to those in the past, the sponsors agreed to defer the consideration of their proposal.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The rationale behind the initiative, succinctly put in the explanatory memorandum accompanying the initial request for the inscription of the item on the agenda, was simple: the increase in the United Nations membership was not being reflected in the membership of the Security Council. Furthermore, in order to strengthen the Security Council's primary role in the maintenance of international peace and security, it was felt that the Council's composition should be reviewed with a view to providing for more balanced representation. The proposal as presented was a modest one, designed to strengthen the Council by making it more responsive and relevant to existing realities. This rationale and the reasons for the proposal as outlined 12 years ago are, I submit, all the more valid today.

The world has changed a great deal since 1979-80. Indeed, it continues to change at a pace that has left all observers wondering about the shape the map of the world will take in a few years or even in a few months or weeks. The breakdown of ideological barriers, and the epoch-making events in Europe and elsewhere, demand that we, the representatives of the 166 countries Members of the United Nations, reassess and reinforce the world body's global role. My delegation is glad to note that these developments have infused the United Nations, in general, and the Security Council, in particular, with a sense of vigour and purpose. There is renewed all-round interest in and support for the United Nations among Member States as well as the people of the entire world. A feeling of general expectation and hope is gaining ground that the United Nations can now be enabled to fulfil the promise enshrined in its Charter in San Francisco over 46 years ago. This was the promise of international cooperation, of economic and social development in all their multifarious dimensions, of amity, justice and progress. But above all it was

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

the promise of international peace and security, a prerequisite for the pursuit of development and progress by mankind. And it is the Security Council on which the Members of the United Nations have conferred the primary responsibility in this field.

What the United Nations Members expect and want from the Organization has been articulated many a time. In the general debate in this very Hall less than three months ago speaker after speaker projected their shared view of the role in today's world of the United Nations and its organs, particularly the Security Council, and how they can be made more responsive to the heightened expectations that reflect today's needs. Almost without exception, they spoke, in varying manner but with a commonality of aspiration, of a new international order based on the Charter of the United Nations and the norms and laws of international relations, in which the United Nations should play a central role.

My Foreign Minister, Shri Madhavsinh Solanki, in his statement before the Assembly on 26 September, while agreeing that the crucial role the United Nations has started to play in various crisis situations was in keeping with its original mandate, stressed that the Organization needed to be strengthened and reformed in order to live up to the enhanced expectations placed in it. He said:

> "one of the challenges faced by the United Nations today is to make it truly representative of the interests and aspirations of all its Members and to make it an arena of cooperative action of all nations and peoples.
>
> "In this context, we should examine, as a matter of urgency, the proposals before us for an expansion of the Security Council to reflect the increased membership of the United Nations and to ensure a more

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

equitable and balanced representation of the Members of the United Nations in the Security Council." (A/46/PV.11, p. 21)

This is the specific idea we are addressing today, an idea endorsed by several delegations in the general debate. Permit me to quote some of them. President Collor of Brazil called for the Organization's decision-making processes to be more open, ensuring wider participation, in the spirit of pluralism and a democratic international system. The President of Nigeria, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, spoke eloquently for the expansion of the Security Council. Mauritius asked that the expanding nature of the United Nations should be representative of the interests of all countries, particularly at the level of the Security Council. Turkey voiced its support for the restructuring of the United Nations, and Tanzania for its democratization. Venezuela's President underlined that the Security Council must be a representative body. Malaysia's Prime Minister, Mr. Mahathir, expressed his belief that a restructured Security Council had a vital role to play. Italy's Foreign Minister defined major goals for the United Nations, one of which would be the expansion of the Security Council, with an increase in the number of both permanent and non-permanent members.

The Charter of the United Nations is a universally acknowledged prescription for relations among States the world over. But like the fast-changing world itself, the Charter cannot be static or immutable. Some of its provisions - for example, the composition of the Security Council - have already come under scrutiny, and rightly so. In this particular context, I should like to refer once again to the dramatic global changes taking place, especially in Europe. These changes inevitably draw attention to the personality, as it were, of the Security Council.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries, meeting at Accra, Ghana, in September of this year, declared that

"the current efforts at reforms of the United Nations should include measures designed to make the decision-making process at the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, more democratic and transparent. In this context, the present membership of the Security Council should be reviewed with a view to reflecting the increaased membership of the United Nations, and promoting more equitable and balanced representation of the Members of the United Nations."

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The recently concluded Second Summit of the Group of 15 at Caracas declared that:

"The United Nations should be reformed so as to increase its efficiency and effectiveness and adapt to the new international situation. The strengthening of the United Nations should be based on the recognition that the management of world affairs is a matter of shared responsibility ...".

In 1946 the United Nations had 51 Members, 11 of which were represented in the Security Council - a reasonably fair ratio. In 1963, the United Nations membership had grown to 113, and the feeling mounted that the Security Council did not retain the representative character it deserved. The result was the vote increasing the Council's membership to 15. The ratio of the Security Council membership to total United Nations membership at that time stood at 7.5, comparing United Nations favourably with the figure of 4.6 in 1946. The comparison in fact suffered much more if one looked only at the ratio for the non-permanent category: it rose from 6.6 to 11.3. The position today is clearly even more unsatisfactory. With a membership of 166, the Security Council has 11.1 United Nations Members represented in each of its seats. In such a context, can one argue that the Security Council, the principal organ for the maintenance of international peace and security, is representative enough to discharge its onerous responsibility in the expected transparent and democratic manner?

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

Rectification is possible in two ways. One of them is to readjust the present number of seats. This approach will, however, not address the main problem of overall under-representation of Members in the Security Council, besides generating its own difficulties. The only logical and politically acceptable method, therefore, is to expand the membership of the Security Council, keeping in mind the provisions of Article 23 of the Charter. My delegation does not intend to make a specific proposal at this stage. It would prefer to engage in urgent, wide-based and purposeful consultations in order to evolve an agreement on the figures and numbers involved, as well as on the exact methodology and its details. However, I would like to emphasize further here the urgency of this process. Momentous decisions affecting all of us are currently on the anvil of the major policy-making organs, and it is only appropriate that these are taken with a broader and more representative participation of the international community.

A main argument often advanced against an increase in the Security Council membership is that it would affect the Council's efficiency and effectiveness. My delegation is not convinced of this argument and cannot accept it. On the contrary, we believe, that a more representative Council will prove more efficient and effective in that its decisions will have that much more weight behind them. Let us not be unmindful of the fact that during the long years of East-West confrontation the Security Council, despite its limited size, often remain paralysed. The Council has been capable or incapable of discharging its functions not because of its size but because of the imperatives of international life. Expansion of the Council is also discouraged on logistical or management grounds. But citing reasons of logistics and management in matters of international peace and security is

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

difficult to accept, especially in the present era where more democratic and transparent conduct of international relations is being stressed. At any rate, we cannot allow management fears to block reforms that would go a long way to strengthen the Council.

My delegation is convinced that a more representative Security Council will be able to discharge its tasks with enhanced efficiency and efficacy. We wish to pursue this objective in a spirit of promoting consensus on what we consider a question of great importance and urgency. We trust that all the Members of the United Nations will be able to support this endeavour.

It is obvious that the General Assembly does not have adequate time to take a substantive decision on this item before the end of the current session. I therefore propose that, at the end of the debate on this item this morning, the Assembly decide to carry this item forward to the forty-seventh session for further consideration.

Mr. MONTAÑO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): For many years it had been considered anathema openly and formally to raise issues such as the nature of the representation of Member States on the Security Council and an increase in the number of its members. Moreover, for a long time it was believed that to discuss in this General Assembly matters regarding the Security Council's structure or operating procedures was inappropriate and tactless. Those who attempted to submit such issues to debate were negatively characterized as responsible for causing Pandora's mythic box to be opened.

It is for these reasons that the Mexican delegation believes that it is of the greatest importance to hold the present debate. It clearly reflects the maturity that has been achieved by our Organization.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

The structure of the Security Council, as well as its functioning and procedures, has constantly given all of our delegations reason for thought and reflection. The mere fact that this first exchange of points of view is taking place reflects the profound changes the international community is experiencing and demonstrates our ongoing concern that the United Nations should be adapted to reflect a changing international reality.

It is precisely the recent developments in the international political arena that have placed the Security Council in a position of increasing importance and caused it to have a greater impact on the work of our Organization and on international relations. Various circumstances have merged to induce unprecedented activity within the Council. From the expansion of the peace-keeping operations system to the mandatory and constant monitoring of events that threaten or run the risk of endangering international peace and security, the Security Council has seen its agenda saturated and its capacity to respond at times overwhelmed.

We appreciate and recognize that the members of this important body have responded to the demands imposed on them with great professionalism and a sense of the responsibility required of them by the United Nations Charter. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to recognize that, at various times, it has been evident that there exists an urgent need to have a body which responds faster, effectively and in a representative fashion corresponding to the overall interest of the membership of this Organization. It must be emphasized that the underlying causes are not a lack of will on the part of its Members but rather structural limitations which, we feel, should be subjected to a timely process of deep reflection.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

In 1979, when this item was first included in the agenda of the General Assembly, as the representative of India has recalled, reasons of equity were invoked for increasing the number of the Council's members. Some stated that such an expansion would inevitably create a heavier and more cumbersome body, which would have difficulty in acting swiftly and taking effective decisions. Others claimed that, in order to strengthen the primary role of the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security, it was of fundamental importance that its composition be examined so as to provide it with a more equitable and balanced representation of the Members of the United Nations, in whose name it acts, in conformity with Article 24, paragraph 1 of the Charter.

The delegation of Mexico finds merit in the positions at both extremes. We agree that increasing the number of members does not necessarily lead to greater efficiency. We nevertheless are of the opinion that, given the unquestionably central role of the Security Council in the international political life of our time, the priority which we should pursue is to adapt it so that it may be truly representative of all our interests, without sacrificing its capacity for appropriate and effective action.

We believe that, in addition to the role of the Security Council in contemporary international life, there are other reasons which lead to the consideration of this item. Among these is the substantial change in the number of Members of the United Nations. In 1963, the last time that the structure of the Council was modified, the United Nations had 113 Members. Everyone knows that, with the increase in the membership of the United Nations to 166, the proportional representation by the 10 non-permanent members of the

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

Security Council has been significantly reduced. However, in the view of my delegation, the issue is not simply a disparity in the mathematical ratio. The lack of more equitable representation tends to impair the principle of sovereign equality of States, all of which share the same concern for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Perhaps the most important issue, however, and doubtless the most delicate and controversial, concerns the changes in the structure and distribution of international power. We all know that the balance of power prevailing in 1945 and during subsequent decades has undergone profound changes and is constantly evolving. It is therefore obvious to us that, in a constructive spirit, we must adapt the Security Council to the prevailing reality of the international order as it exists at the end of the century in which we live.

At the San Francisco conference, the delegation of Mexico, in endorsing the article related to the composition of the Security Council, stated that the text was an implicit application of the legal principle establishing a relationship between powers and obligations, safeguarding the basic principle of the equal rights of all States. Mexico interpreted that article as granting broader rights to the States designated as permanent members, mainly because those nations had the greatest responsibility for the maintenance of peace within the international community. We must ask ourselves whether today the foregoing principle has been upheld or whether, on the contrary, those States which currently have a decisive weight in international affairs are marginalized from the Security Council, both with respect to powers and responsibilities.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

It is possible that a thoughtful consideration of these issues may lead to the conclusion that it is necessary to expand the membership of the Security Council. We might also conclude that the structure of the Council should be modified within its present size. In any event, Mexico considers it a priority that a careful examination of these issues be initiated without prejudice to any conclusion which may be reached. Towards that end, we can profit from the reflection which is necessarily prompted by the forthcoming commemoration of the half-century of the United Nations.

Our approach is constructive and oriented towards the need to have a body which acts effectively and with the full legitimacy of the community of nations. We cannot postpone the imperative need to democratize international relations, and this can only be successfully accomplished if organs such as the Security Council are constituted in a manner that is genuinely representative of Member States. At the same time, it is our opinion that an exercise, such as the one we propose, would give an impetus to the continuous dialogue which should exist between the Security Council and the General Assembly, and would simultaneously strengthen the mandate of the latter in conformity with Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter.

The composition of the Security Council should reflect the current balance of power, and we should regard the criteria of special responsibility and legal equality of States as an indivisible set of principles. It should also make it possible to take into account the new centres of power which have arisen in recent decades, as well as the new criteria for assessing power and its nature in international politics.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

The delegation of Mexico believes that the proposed examination would be genuinely beneficial to all Member States. If, as a result of such a process, we could recommend changes that enhance transparency and openness in Security Council proceedings, foster a balanced relationship between its mandate and the mandate of the General Assembly, and adequately represent the centres of international power, we would then have achieved the objectives set forth in the San Francisco Charter, whose principles continue to be as valid now as they were then.

In conclusion, the delegation of Mexico would like fully to support the proposal of the permanent representative of India to the effect that this item remain under discussion at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

Mr. ARRIA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Equitable means just, correct and reasonable. When five nations are more equal because of the privilege of the veto than the other 161 Members of our Organization, then the subject of equitable representation and an increase in the membership of the Security Council becomes a subject of extreme validity and importance to be considered in fashioning a new and emerging international order.

I should like to address the subject of equitable representation in the membership of the Council together with the inseparable subject of the veto power of the permanent members of the Council. We believe that an increase in the membership of the Council, without the elimination of the anachronistic veto power, would not only be senseless but certainly would not be equitable.

I had the opportunity of listening to and reading carefully the statement of the representative of India, Mr. Gharekhan, about the need to obtain a better balance of representation on the Security Council as a way of contributing to its prestige and effectiveness in global terms.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

We are in complete agreement, and we support his views as to the urgent need to expand the membership of the Security Council so that we may have a more representative and more efficient Council whose decisions carry much greater weight.

I should like to address the question of the veto power in the context of 1945, when it was adopted, and in the context of today's totally different realities. I want to put into historical perspective the conflicting views that have been presented in connection with this subject. From the very beginning - in San Francisco - the principle of the veto power was questioned. Its first severe critic was Mr. Herbert Evatt, the then representative of Australia, who called it an absurd imposition on the international community. Venezuela is on record as having made a similar statement. In San Francisco our then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Caracciolo Parra Perez presented our position by saying that it was his hope that this formula would, with the passage of time, evolve into a more democratic and representative system that could involve all nations.

In 1947 the then representative of Venezuela, Carlos Eduardo Stolk, said in the General Assembly:

> "The much debated question of revising the United Nations Charter in order to abolish or limit the veto power, is once again under discussion. Our country supports with unshakable determiration the principle of the sovereign equality of all nations, which is not compatible with the privilege granted to the permanent members of the Security Council under Article 27 of the Charter. We recognize that the application of this Article has ... impaired its authority and the prestige of the Organization". (Official Records, second session, p. 73)

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

It was not until April 1947 that the veto power became a subject of much discussion in the United Nations, and even the United States Congress started to consider whether it would be appropriate to abolish it.

This subject was again discussed owing to the Soviet Union's reaction to the United Nations programmes of assistance to Greece and Turkey. I should like to refer to a few of the statements that were made at that time. On 3 April 1947 Sir Alexander Cadogan, the then representative of the United Kingdom, said:

"The United Nations has been stifled and turned into a sterile Organization because of the abusive use of the veto by the Soviet Union."

In August 1947 John Foster Dulles said:

"Removal of the veto power from the five permanent members is necessary. International policies that create fear or bitterness anywhere must be subjected to the scrutiny of the General Assembly."

At that time the representative of Argentina, José Arce, presented a draft resolution asking the General Assembly to convene a conference of Member States for the purpose of abolishing this privilege. He said:

"The United Nations cannot work with the veto power. We support the idea of legal equality of all States."

The then representative of the United States, Warren Austin, said:

"The Charter does not need to be changed at this time. The only thing that needs to be done is to raise its level of ethics. The Charter will grow and adapt to the needs of mankind in the course of time."

Among all these statements was a very surprising one made by Andrei Gromyko at the same General Assembly session. He said that the origin of the veto was an initiative not of the Soviet Union but, rather, of the United States President, Mr. Roosevelt, and the British Prime Minister,

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

Mr. Churchill. Gromyko said that the United States and the United Kingdom were the initiators of the veto and that the Soviet Union had supported President Roosevelt's proposal because it was felt that the unanimity of the great Powers, as a principle, would contribute to the maintenance of peace.

If one reads editions of The New York Times of 1945 and 1947 one will see that the context of that period is completely different from that of today. But the important thing is not who put forth this initiative but, rather, the fact that the privilege was granted unanimously for the five permanent members of the Security Council. In this connection, I should like to cite a letter to The Times of London in 1947, in which Lord Esher said:

> "It would be a mistake to suppose that Mr. Molotov and Mr. Gromyko are the prime exponents of a negative vote. In the year 1653, the inconceivable law of liberum veto allowed for the possibility of a veto in the Polish Parliament by one individual simply by pronunciation of the words 'I will not permit it.' That law lasted 200 years. What is incredible is not that it lasted so long but, rather, the fact that 150 years after its revocation in Poland it is still alive and still exists as a privilege in the Security Council of the United Nations."

The reasons for maintaining the veto privilege in 1945 were as debatable at that time as they are today, as we observe the fragmentation of the Soviet Union and the emergence of a commonwealth that has even agreed to the creation of market economies, the promotion of private enterprise and the defence of private initiative. This represents an embracing of the democratic values and ideals of the West rather than a call to arms. Sweeping away old structures and opening the path to something new, the agreement that created the Soviet Union in 1922 was also adopted in a climate different from today's. This

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

agreement has been ended by the current leaders in a brief statement of a few paragraphs. Profound changes are once again occurring in that great land.

An increase in the membership of the Security Council should not require major arguments. When the United Nations membership increased from 51 in 1945 to 115 in 1963, the Security Council membership increased from 6 to 10. As we know we are now 166 Members - three times the number in 1945. The fact that the membership of the Security Council was increased in 1963 was in recognition of the increase in the number of States Members of the United Nations. Today the case is stronger still because in today's world order there are economic Powers that did not exist at that time, such as Germany and Japan. The creation of supranational entities such as the European Community is another highly significant factor that must be taken into account. We believe in a new structure, with an increase in the permanent members, or a restructuring of the composition of the permanent members, so as to reflect today's political and economic realities.

At the current session of the General Assembly the President of Venezuela, Mr. Carlos Andres Perez, expressed very clearly his concern about the need to make the Security Council more representative. He said:

> "our own people's aspiration for democracy [must be also the] aspiration of the United Nations. The Organization will not be strengthened unless an agreement is reached to eliminate the right of veto ..., a right that responded to circumstances and realities that have ceased to exist. This mechanism ... limits its effective contributions to collective security. The right to veto limits the achievement of consensus".
>
> (A/46/PV.8, p. 13)

I should like to reiterate the proposal the President of Venezuela made on that occasion that the Assembly entrust to a committee of experts the study

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

of new structures for the Organization and the functioning of the Security Council. The countries now holding a decisive advantage would be permanent members of the Council, and the membership might also be expanded. Decisions on collective security would need at least half the votes of the qualified majority of its members to reflect the general will of the international community.

The present trend towards the democratization of international relations offers a major opportunity for the establishment of a new order that is more just. Undoubtedly, a democratized Security Council must be a part of that new order. It is clear that substantial changes are taking place in the world. Why, then, should our Organization be the only one that is not changing? Just yesterday the European Community and its leaders reached agreement on a Treaty that puts them on the path to closer economic and political integration and, I emphasize, to the establishment of a common defence and foreign policy. This event should make it clear that there is a need to examine and restructure the nature and composition of the Security Council.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

I believe that it is also clear that these events have a direct bearing on three of the Permament Members of the Security Council. Whenever a suggestion is made for change, we are told that such a step would open a Pandora's box. However, I must say that such an attitude has come to represent immobility in the United Nations.

The real symbol of our time is openness and change. We cannot continue to advocate the need for change throughout the world and at the same time disregard our own needs in our own House. We must prepare the Organization for an equitable and representative world, and we must do so soon.

Mr. TRAXLER (Italy): In the past few years many international developments have made possible what is generally recognized as a veritable renaissance of the United Nations. The end of the cold war and of the bitter ideological struggle between East and West have created conditions for a more balanced and rational approach to the solution of political and military conflicts. The success of United Nations intervention and mediation in regional conflicts would not have been possible without the positive changes in international relations.

At the same time the recognition that such global problems as the preservation of the environment or the rational utilization of common natural resources can be tackled only within the framework of a universal political organization has widened the horizon of the United Nations, making the Organization a truly indispensable tool for the international community.

One of the measures to be taken to confer upon the United Nations the authority necessary to meet its responsibilities in the political field is, from our point of view, to assure adequate representativeness to the Security Council.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

As my Foreign Minister stated on 27 September, Italy feels that the time has come to adjust the structure of the Security Council. In fact, the new international reality underlines the need to involve in our collective responsibility countries that have hitherto played a role not commensurate with their importance and that are now acquiring new political and economic dimensions together with an awareness of their growing responsibilities.

Italy is in favour of an expansion of the Security Council with an increase in the number of both permament and non-permanent members, which would not necessarily entail extending the right of veto to all the new permament members. We feel that the selection of the latter should be made on the basis of such objective criteria as the size of the country's population, its gross national product and its contribution to the United Nations budget.

The Security Council was first expanded in 1963 to take account of the increase in the number of Member States. Since then, the United Nations membership has risen from 113 to 166, an increase of almost 50 per cent. This factor is in itself sufficient to warrant an expansion of this decision-making body of the Organization. Since it is required to make choices of major importance, the Security Council should fully reflect the evolution of the world community.

At the end of the Second World War it appeared logical that the preservation of what was then a new order should be primarily entrusted to the countries that were recognized as its major pillars. Subsequently, in an essentially bipolar situation, those same countries became the major proponents of the two conflicting ideologies that dominated the world. This situation has changed. Many countries and peoples are now painfully redefinining their goals and aspirations, thereby often engendering conflicts

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

with the goals and aspirations of their neighbours. Such hitherto unlimited commodities as air and water are now perceived as finite. Mankind's unchecked multiplication seems to lead to its own destruction.

In these circumstances the search for peace where it does not exist or its maintenance where it does requires even more intricate processes of crisis management. The same logic that identified a limited number of countries as founders and guardians of a certain order would now call for the attribution of a similar role to those few other countries that will be called upon to exercise the greater efforts and bear the major costs, social as well as economic, for the establishment and maintenance of a new order.

There is in the Assembly a growing awareness of the need to overhaul the machinery of the United Nations. The time seems to be near when the composition of one of its major organs should also be revised.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): This item was included in the agenda of the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. However, it has not hitherto been the subject of any profound debate. Since that time, the Assembly has continued to defer the item to subsequent sessions without discussion.

The positive developments that have recently taken place on the international scene have given the item a new dimension. A new era of international relations now appears on the horizon as a result of the historic changes that have occurred in many parts of the world. Policies of confrontation and ideological conflict have given way to policies of dialogue and cooperation. The ramifications of these positive developments have reflected on the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, and in particular on the Security Council,

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

which has undoubtedly turned a new leaf in the manner of its handling of international and regional problems.

Recently, it has been noted that the Security Council has begun effectively and seriously to seek peaceful settlements of problems that were aggravated in the cold war period. With the end of that period, we must all seek to lay the foundations for a new era based on justice and equality among nations and peoples and on the cessation of the policies of polarization and hegemony, a new era based on the principles of the United Nations Charter and on the realization of the international order whose foundations were set forth in the Charter.*

---

* Mr. Traxler (Italy), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

The way in which the Security Council has dealt with successive recent developments has given a sense of confidence to the international community and has resuscitated confidence in the Charter and in the ability of this Organization to achieve the results for which it was established. Of more importance is the greater clarity of vision for the international community. It has become manifestly clear that the reason of the United Nations inability to discharge its responsibilities fully for many years was not any deficiency in the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter but rather in the lack of political will on the part of Member States, in particular the permanent members of the Security Council.

The future of the international order and the possibilities of developing it and building upon it for the benefit of international peace and security, or the failure of that order will depend above all on the ability of the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities stipulated in the Charter and its discharge of those responsibilities without dereliction, discrimination or double standards. Hence the international interest in reviving this item and imbuing the debate on it with a new dimension that would be consonant with the positive developments witnessed in the world today. It is the hope of Egypt's delegation that the General Assembly will accord this matter its due importance, as reflected in the statements made by the heads of delegations at this session and in the statements made today.

In the light of the aforesaid, it may be appropriate for the General Assembly to consider the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council. It was agreed previously to introduce a limited modification in 1963, which led to increasing the Council's membership from 11 to 15 members. Now, when the United Nations

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

membership has grown to 166 Members, it is only natural for many States to call for a comprehensive study of the subject, including consideration of a corresponding increase in the Council's membership. The objective to which we all aspire is to increase the efficacy of the Council in discharging its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. AIT CHAALAL (Algeria) (interpretation from French): It gives the Algerian delegation great satisfaction to speak today on item 38 of the agenda of this session of the General Assembly, entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council". The Algerian delegation, which together with other delegations took the initiative of having this item inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly in 1979, is pleased to see that at last debate is beginning on a question whose importance we have always emphasized.

We had to be patient for some 10 years, but this debate is finally taking place. The major political changes that have occurred in international relations have undoubtedly created the conditions that have given this issue a decisive impetus.

The new world order being discussed today cannot be constructed without strict respect for the principles on which our Organization is based and which are enshrined in its Charter. In this respect, the fundamental principle of the sovereign equality of Member States has its most democratic reflection in the composition and functioning of the General Assembly. The same concern for democratic principles should be reflected, mutatis mutandis, in the composition of the Security Council.

It is true that the Charter clearly recognizes, on the one hand, the special responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of

(Mr. Ait Chaalal, Algeria)

international peace and security and, on the other, special prerogatives for the permanent members. But that special responsibility should be read and interpreted in the light of Article 24 of the Charter, which clearly states that that special responsibility is conferred upon the Security Council for the specific purpose of ensuring prompt and effective action by the United Nations, and on condition that it is acting on behalf of the Member States.

The organic link thus established between the members of the Security Council and the other Members of the United Nations is made clear in Article 15, paragraph 1 of the Charter, which provides that the Security Council must address to the General Assembly for its consideration annual and special reports, including an account of the measures the Security Council has decided upon or taken.

In the light of those provisions of the Charter and of the political necessity for dialogue and cooperation between the General Assembly and the Security Council, it is essential that the composition of the Council faithfully and equitably reflect that of the General Assembly. This could not but contribute significantly to enabling our Organization to function in a more democratic and harmonious, and therefore effective, way.

Since the last amendment to the Charter on this question - now three decades ago - the number of States Members of the United Nations has increased from 113 to 166. This increase has not been reflected in any modification of the composition of the Security Council, whose membership has been frozen at 15. Other principal or subsidiary organs of the United Nations have progressively adapted their composition to the new international dimensions and realities, even if that has not always been done in a completely satisfactory way. It would be paradoxical if the Security Council, which

(Mr. Ait Chaalal, Algeria)

bears such a great responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security, were to remain the sole organ that does not take into account the constant enlargement of the international community.

(Mr. Ait Challal, Algeria)

The time has come to review the composition of the Security Council in order to ensure that the representation on it is more equitable and more just and takes better account of the increase in the number of States Members of the United Nations.

The Algerian delegation is among those which have always felt that it is in the true interest of all Member States to make the mechanisms, structures and activities of the United Nations reflect the quantitative and qualitative changes which are constantly taking place in the international community. Recent international events offer us striking examples of such qualitative changes on the world political scene which the United Nations must deal with, both in organizational terms and in terms of the Organization's internal operation. That will certainly be a long-term undertaking, and my delegation will make its contribution to it at the proper time. Even today, however, we can prepare the groundwork by expanding the membership of the Security Council in order to ensure more equitable geographical representation on it, particularly for the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America; that would make the Council more representative and would enable it to discharge more effectively its functions and responsibilities under the Charter.

Mr. SARDENBERG (Brazil): The issue we are considering today is neither a new nor an ordinary one. As a matter of fact, the item entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council" has been on our agenda since the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. For more than 10 years, however, the item has not been the subject of formal substantive discussion.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

This year a combination of various factors seems to have generated enough momentum to justify conducting the present exchange of views. Even though the item has repeatedly been overlooked in the recent past, the question itself - the need to address the issue of the composition of the Security Council in the light of the intense and far-reaching changes taking place in international relations - has continued to be discussed, both within and outside the United Nations. In recent years a growing number of seminars and lectures have touched upon the required adaptation in the Council's membership, an issue that has similarly been mooted and discussed in a series of meetings held and declarations made by various groups and organizations and in analyses by prestigious authors which appeared in publications in various parts of the world.

In the United Nations the question of appropriate consideration of the issue of the composition of the Security Council was referred to by a number of delegations during this year's general debate, and the subject is frequently mentioned in informal talks between interested delegations.

While fully recognizing the sensitivity of the issue and the sense of responsibility and caution with which it must necessarily be examined, Brazil welcomes the discussions currently taking place. All things considered, the time is ripe to begin dealing with the question, and there are several indications pointing in that direction. The Security Council is too important an organ not to reflect, in its composition as in other respects, the fundamental changes which have taken place in the United Nations and indeed in the world order, since 1963, the one and only time when there has been a numerical adjustment in the Council's membership.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

At that time, almost 30 years ago, the number of non-permanent seats on the Council was increased from 6 to 10, basically in order to reflect the growth of an Organization that had gone from its original 51 Member States to 113, thanks mainly to the success of the decolonization process. Today the membership of the United Nations has reached 166 States, while the number of seats on the Security Council remains unchanged. The ratio of the total number of countries Members of the United Nations to the number of seats on the Council is 11.06 to 1. It was 7.53 to 1 in 1963, and 4.63 to 1 when the United Nations came into being. To put it in other figures, in 1945 over 20 per cent of the Members were represented on the Council. Despite the increase in the number of non-permanent seats, that fraction dropped to 13 per cent in 1963, and at present it is roughly 9 per cent.

The position of Brazil on this matter is well known to the international community. Two years ago, speaking from this rostrum, Brazil called for a re-examination of the adequacy of the Council's composition, not only from the traditional standpoint of re-establishing a proper relationship between the number of seats and the total membership of the United Nations but also, and especially, in the light of the changes in political relationships that had taken place on the international scene since the end of the Second World War. It was then suggested that an additional category of permanent members, with no veto power, could be considered. As Ambassador Gharekhan, the Permanent Representative of India, has just recalled, President Fernando Collor of Brazil called for a United Nations decision-making process that was more open, ensuring wider participation in the spirit of pluralism and a democratic international system.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

If one takes into account the fact that the situation in 1989 already allowed for references to changing relationships, there can be no doubt that today that assertion remains more valid than ever. As it approaches its golden jubilee, the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, is required to face increasingly complex tasks, not the least of which are those of further democratizing the Organization and making it more effective.

Arguments have been raised in the past to the effect that any increase in the Council's composition would endanger the efficiency of that principal organ of the United Nations. Nothing could be more foreign to our intent: we envisage a more balanced and representative composition for the Security Council, one that would further contribute to its effectiveness and responsiveness. Using simple reasoning, one could say that a one-member Council would be the most efficient, but it would certainly be the least democratic. One might also say that the most democratic Council would comprise the entire membership, but it would most probably be the least efficient. Somewhere between those two extremes, a sound and satisfactory solution should be found, by the usual diplomatic means.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

In his inspired speech to the Assembly some days ago, his first as Secretary-General-designate, Mr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, referring to the basic issues that in his view confront the international community, stated,

"There is the need to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security in conformity with the Charter. This requires the strengthening of the United Nations machinery in a manner that would enable it to fulfil its important objectives not only in peace-keeping but in peace-making and peace-building as well." (A/46/PV.59, p. 12)

My delegation believes that the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council should be considered in this context with prudence, care and foresight in order to enhance the future ability of the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, to cope with its fundamental responsibilities for safeguarding international peace and security.

It is in this spirit that Brazil takes part in the debate on agenda item 38. In the same spirit, my country will continue to participate in future discussions on this crucial issue. The evolving realities of the international situation and the central role the United Nations is being called upon to play in the shaping of the future of mankind indicate that the time has come for this question to receive the attention and thorough consideration it certainly deserves. The delegation of Brazil, therefore, supports the proposal made by the distinguished representative of India that this item be carried forward to the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly for further consideration.

Mr. GAMBARI (Nigeria): Since being introduced in 1978, the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council has remained one of the most contentious and critical issues before

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

the General Assembly. Probably as a reflection of the sensitivity of this issue, the Assembly has not been able to address it effectively, but instead has kept on deferring it. We have now reached a stage where it has become inappropriate to continue to delay its substantive consideration. The unprecedented speed with which the world has changed over the past two years and the potential role and promise that the future holds for the United Nations make it imperative that this issue be considered now, objectively and realistically.

The reality is that the world has undergone tremendous changes since the creation of the Organization in 1945. The United Nations, which started with an original membership of 52 States, now has 166.

Secondly, the configuration of power has also changed radically. The victorious Powers of the Second World War are no longer the exclusive preeminent Powers. Other Powers and regions have since emerged. For instance, Africa, which had only four Member States at the inception of the Organization, now constitutes the largest regional group, which, with 51 Members accounts for almost one third of the Organization's membership.

Thirdly, the role and functions of the Organization have undergone important changes. Old preoccupations have given way to new. Issues such as decolonization have almost been resolved, while new areas such as the environment are gaining well-deserved recognition and attention. Still, other matters such as disarmament are still being grappled with. Similarly, hitherto prominent structures such as the Trusteeship Council and the Fourth Committee are gradually giving way, while peace-keeping operations and observer missions have evolved significantly. Likewise, issues of economics and development are now being given great attention.

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

Finally, a new world order is being established which promises to replace confrontation with consensus and conflict with cooperation. The wave of democratization in so many parts of the world is ushering in an era of freedom and self-determination and the quest for collective security.

In the face of these realities and developments, the objective fact is that, of all the organs of the United Nations, the Security Council has been the least responsive. It is true that the Council was expanded in 1963 from nine to 15 members, but its structure does not accord with present-day reality. The regional groups are not equitably represented. African and Asian countries have a total of three seats each; countries of the Latin American and Caribbean Group have two seats, as do those of Eastern Europe; while countries of the Group of Western European and Other States have a total of five seats. Furthermore, of the five permanent, veto-wielding members, three are from the Group of Western European and Other States, one each from Asia and the Eastern European Group, while Africa and Latin America do not have any. This arrangement can hardly be said to be democratic.

There is, therefore, the need to restructure the Security Council to make it more equitably representative and democratic. Many, ourselves included, have been wondering what effect the unification of Europe in 1992 will have on the makeup of the Security Council. For example, could a single European political entity continue to maintain two permanent seats and an additional one or two non-permanent seats on the Council? What of the developments in Eastern Europe, particularly the events unfolding in the Soviet Union? What impact will these have? There is also the question of those Member States that have now emerged as major contributors to the Organization. Are they, together with other countries that represent a great percentage of the world's population, not justified in seeking greater representation on the Security

(Mr. Gambari, Nigeria)

Council? There is also the issue of the continuing relevance of veto power, especially considering that not a single veto has been cast throughout 1990 and 1991, despite the Gulf crisis.

Questions like these should be examined objectively and discussed frankly. The legitimacy of the Council and the moral authority of the Organization can only be enhanced if the favourable wind of democratization that is sweeping across the world passes through the United Nations. This will go a long way towards promoting in the minds of many States the positive nature of the nature of the new world order which is emerging, a new world order in which the United Nations is expected to play a leading and crucial role.

The world is dynamic and it has come a long way since 1945. The United Nations and all its organs should be adapted to changing circumstances in order to enhance their credibility, relevance and overall acceptability. The Organization remains the only truly global forum of international legitimacy and multilateral diplomacy. All its principal organs, without exception, should be truly representative of all the regions and all the nations of the world, in an equitable and democratic manner.

The PRESIDENT: A proposal has been made that the General Assembly defer further consideration of this item to the forty-seventh session, and that it include this item in the provisional agenda of that session.

May I take it that the General Assembly decides to defer further consideration of this item to its forty-seventh session and to include the item in the provisional agenda of the forty-seventh session?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 38.

AGENDA ITEMS 99, 100, 101 AND 12 (continued), 103, AND 19 (continued)

INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/46/625)

ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/46/626)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS; REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL: REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/46/627)

OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/46/628)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES: REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/46/629)

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, Mr. James Kember of New Zealand, to present the reports of the Fourth Committee.

Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I have the honour once again to present to the General Assembly for its consideration reports of the Fourth Committee. These five reports relate respectively to agenda items 19, 99, 100, 101 and 12, and 103.

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

The first report, contained in document A/46/629, relates to 16 Territories under agenda item 19 and includes a recommendation of the Fourth Committee regarding the assistance of the specialized agencies and the international institutions to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Set out in the report are four draft resolutions, two draft consensuses and one draft decision.

As will be seen from the recommendations of the Fourth Committee, two of the draft resolutions relate to, respectively, Western Sahara and New Caledonia. The third draft resolution is the result of an initiative taken by the Special Committee of 24 to consolidate in a single resolution the individual resolutions on the following Territories: American Samoa, Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Guam, Montserrat, Tokelau, the Turks and Caicos Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

Also under item 19 is a draft resolution relating to the participation of the specialized agencies and the international institutions in the work of the General Assembly.

The two draft consensuses relate, respectively, to Gibraltar and Pitcairn, and the draft decision to St. Helena.

By adopting these proposals, the General Assembly would emphasize the need to pay special attention to the situation in small island Territories, which suffer handicaps arising from such factors as size, remoteness, geographical dispersion, vulnerability to natural disasters, fragility of ecosystems, constraints on transport and communications, great distances from market centres, highly limited internal markets, lack of natural resources, weak indigenous technological capacity, the acute problem of obtaining fresh

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

water supplies, heavy dependence on imports and a small number of commodities, depletion of non-renewable resources, migration, shortage of administrative personnel and heavy financial burdens.

The General Assembly would also reiterate that it is the responsibility of the administering Powers to create such conditions in those Territories as will enable their peoples to exercise freely and without interference their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The Assembly would reaffirm that it is ultimately for the people of those Territories to determine freely their future political status in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration, and would call upon the administering Powers to facilitate the programmes of political education to foster awareness among the people of the possibilities open to them in the exercise of their right to self-determination.

In reaffirming that it is the responsibility of the administering Powers to promote the economic and social development of the Territories, the General Assembly would recommend to the administering Powers that priority continue to be given to strengthening and diversifying the economies of those Territories. It would also urge the administering Powers to foster closer relations between the Territories and other island communities. The Assembly would appeal to the administering Powers to continue or to resume their participation in future meetings and activities of the Special Committee and to ensure the participation in the work of the Special Committee of representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Mindful that the United Nations visiting missions provide the means of ascertaining the situation in small Territories, the General Assembly would

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

urge the administering Powers to facilitate the dispatch of such visiting missions to the Territories to secure first-hand information and to ascertain the wishes and aspirations of the inhabitants. The Assembly would also urge Member States to contribute to the efforts of the United Nations to achieve the eradication of colonialism by the year 2000, and would call upon them to continue to give their full support to the Special Committee's action towards the attainment of that objective.

As regards draft resolution I, on Western Sahara, the General Assembly would, among other things, welcome the unanimous adoption of resolution 690 (1991), by which the Security Council approved the report submitted by the Secretary-General and decided to establish under its authority a United Nations mission for the referendum in Western Sahara. The Assembly would also welcome the entry into force of the cease-fire in Western Sahara on 6 September 1991, and endorse the call by the Security Council upon the two parties to continue to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General in the implementation of his plan laid out in his reports to the Security Council.

The General Assembly would also express its full support for the efforts of the Secretary-General for the organization and supervision by the United Nations, in cooperation with the Organization of African Unity, of a referendum for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara, in accordance with the objectives set out in his report to the Security Council dated 19 April 1991.

With respect to draft resolution III, on New Caledonia, the General Assembly would note the importance of the positive measures that continue to be pursued in that Territory by the French authorities in cooperation with all

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

sectors of the population in order to provide a framework for its peaceful progress to self-determination. It would also urge all the parties involved, in the interest of all the people of New Caledonia, to maintain their dialogue in a spirit of harmony. The Assembly would also invite all parties involved to continue promoting a framework for the peaceful progress of the Territory towards an act of self-determination in which all options were open, and which would safeguard the rights of all New Caledonians.

Concerning Gibraltar, the Assembly would recall that the statement agreed to by the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at Brussels on 27 November 1984 stipulates, inter alia, the establishment of a negotiating process aimed at overcoming all the differences between them over Gibraltar. The Assembly would take note of the fact that, as part of this process, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the two countries have held annual meetings alternately in each capital, and would urge both Governments to continue their negotiations with the object of reaching a definitive solution to the problem of Gibraltar in the light of relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

In the course of the debates in the Fourth Committee this year, a desire was expressed for greater cooperation and coordination of the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in their assistance to Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was also noted that in many instances those agencies and institutions are not represented at the Committee's meetings when items relating to their field of activity are being discussed. By adopting the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in that connection, the Assembly would invite those agencies and institutions to increase their participation in its debates on the remaining Territories, with a view to apprising the Assembly of their development programmes in those Territories and thereby facilitating more informed comments on their work.

The Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to report to it at its forty-seventh session on the measures taken to promote cooperation and coordination between specialized agencies and international institutions in their assistance to Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The second report of the Committee (A/46/627) relates to the implementation by those agencies and institutions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which the Committee took up under agenda items 101 and 12. The proposal contained in the report would have the General Assembly, inter alia, request those organizations to strengthen measures of support and formulate adequate programmes of assistance to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, bearing in mind that such assistance should not only meet their immediate needs but also create conditions for development after they have exercised their right to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

In that connection, the General Assembly would draw the attention of the agencies and institutions to the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Meeting of Governmental Experts of Island Developing Countries and Donor Countries and Organizations, held at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 25 to 29 June 1990.

The Assembly would urge those agencies and institutions in formulating their assistance programmes to take due account of those conclusions and recommendations and to examine and review conditions in each Territory so as to take appropriate measures to accelerate progress in the economic and social sectors of those Territories.

Specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations would also be requested to provide humanitarian and other assistance to newly independent and emerging States in order to enable them to consolidate their political independence and achieve genuine economic independence.

The third report (A/46/625) relates to agenda item 99, on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter. The Fourth Committee recommends, among other things, that the General Assembly should reaffirm that, in the absence of a decision by the Assembly itself to the effect that a Non-Self-Governing Territory has attained a full measure of self-government in terms of Chapter XI of the Charter, the administering Power concerned should continue to transmit information under Article 73 e with respect to that Territory, as well as information on political and constitutional developments in the Territories concerned.

The fourth report (A/46/626) relates to agenda item 100, on the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the Non-Self-Governing

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

Territories. Among other provisions, the General Assembly would reaffirm the inalienable right of the peoples of colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories to the enjoyment of the natural resources of their Territories, as well as their right to dispose of those resources in their best interests. The Assembly would also condemn those activities of foreign economic and other interests which impede the implementation of the Declaration and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination.

In a separate decision on the military activities and arrangements in colonial Territories which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration, the Fourth Committee recommends that the General Assembly should call upon the colonial Powers concerned to terminate such activities and to eliminate such military bases in compliance with the related resolutions of the Assembly.

The last report (A/46/628) relates to offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, under agenda item 103. In expressing its appreciation to those Member States that have made scholarships available to the inhabitants of such Territories, the Assembly would express its view that the continuation and expansion of offers of scholarships are essential in order to meet the need of students from Non-Self-Governing Territories for educational and training assistance. Conscious of the importance of promoting the educational advancement of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, it would also invite Member States to make, or to continue making, generous offers of study and training facilities and would urge the administering Powers to take effective measures to ensure the widespread and continuous dissemination in the Territories under their administration of information relating to such offers.

(Mr. Kember, Rapporteur, Fourth Committee)

On behalf of the Fourth Committee, I should like to commend these reports to the attention of the General Assembly.

At this point, I should like to thank the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, Ambassador Charles Flemming of Saint Lucia, for his leadership and for the advice and guidance he has given to me in connection with my tasks as Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee. I should also like to express my gratitude to all the members of the Fourth Committee for the cooperation, assistance and friendship they again extended to me during the session, as well as to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Wilfrid De Souza, and his colleagues in the Secretariat.

Before concluding, I should like to recall that Ambassador Flemming, following the lead of his predecessor, has left open the possibility of inter-sessional consultations on the Fourth Committee's work. Many speakers during the general debate in the Committee made observations on the manner in which the Committee's objectives could best be realized. At a time when rationalization is a process permeating the United Nations system, the Fourth Committee will surely, as the Special Committee on decolonization has done, meet the challenge without any compromise on the principles of decolonization that are its guiding beacon.

It has been a privilege for me to serve as an officer of the Committee for the past two years.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fourth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

May I also remind delegations that, again in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401 explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Fourth Committee, I should like to advise representatives that, unless delegations have already notified the Secretariat otherwise, we shall proceed with the voting in the same manner as the Fourth Committee did. This means that where the Fourth Committee took recorded votes, we shall do the same.

I also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Fourth Committee.

We shall first consider the report of the Fourth Committee (A/46/625) on agenda item 99, "Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations".

(The President)

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report (A/46/625).

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 157 to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 46/63).

The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 99.

We turn now to the report (A/46/626) of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 100, entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa".

I should like to point out that in the French version of the report (A/46/626) of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 100, sub-paragraph F of paragraph 13 is missing, and that on page 22 "paragraph 4" should read "paragraph 14".

The Assembly will first take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 14 of its report. The draft resolution is entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Belarus, Côte d'Ivoire, Fiji, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Panama, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay

The draft resolution was adopted by 109 to 34, with 16 abstentions (resolution 46/64).

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 15 of its report (A/46/626). The draft decision is entitled "Military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples".

(The President)

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Belarus, Côte d'Ivoire, Fiji, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Panama, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay

The draft decision was adopted by 108 to 34, with 16 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 100.

We turn now to the report (A/46/627) of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 101, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations", and agenda item 12, entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council".

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Côte d'Ivoire, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Panama, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, Uruguay

The draft resolution was adopted by 115 to 28, with 17 abstentions (resolution 46/65).

The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 101 and of chapters I and VII (section C) of the report of the Economic and Social Council (agenda item 12).

We turn now to the report (A/46/628) of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 103, entitled "Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories".

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

The Fourth Committee adopted that draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 46/66).

The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 103.

(The President)

We shall now consider the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 19 (A/46/629) concerning chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to specific Territories not covered by other agenda items.

The Assembly will now proceed to take decisions on the various recommendations of the Fourth Committee. I shall put the recommendations to the Assembly one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their vote.

We turn first to the four draft resolutions recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 27 of its report (A/46/629).

Draft resolution I, entitled "Question of Western Sahara", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 46/67)

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Questions of American Samoa, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Guam, Montserrat, Tokelau, Turks and Caicos Islands and United States Virgin Islands", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 46/68 A and B)

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled "Question of New Caledonia", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 46/69).

The PRESIDENT: The Fourth Committee adopted without objection draft resolution IV, entitled "Cooperation and coordination of specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in their assistance to Non-Self-Governing Territories". May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 46/70).

The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to turn to the two draft consensuses recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 28 of its report (A/46/629).

Draft consensus I, entitled "Question of Gibraltar", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft consensus I was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus II, entitled "Question of Pitcairn", was also adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft consensus II was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the draft decision entitled "Question of Saint Helena" that was recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 29 of its report (A/46/629). A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

The draft decision was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 19 (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES:

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/46/23; A/AC.109/1056-A/AC.109/1063, A/AC.109/1064 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/1065-A/AC.109/1067, A/AC.109/1068 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/1069-A/AC.109/1071, A/AC.109/1073, A/AC.109/1074 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/1075-A/AC.109/1078, A/AC/109/1079 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/1082)

(b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/46/589, A/46/593, A/46/634/Rev.1 and Corr.1)

(c) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/46/L.22/Rev.1, A/46/L.27 and Corr.1, A/46/L.28)

(d) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/46/762)

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now resume its consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as a whole, under agenda item 19. May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 49th plenary meeting, held on 19 November.

In connection with this item, three draft resolutions have been issued as documents A/46/L.22/Rev.1, A/46/L.27 and Corr.1 and A/46/L.28.

I call on Mr. Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba, Acting Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, who will introduce draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and Corr.1 and A/46/L.28.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba), Acting Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Special Committee of 24) (interpretation from Spanish): The debate that has taken place on this item reaffirms the importance that the General Assembly

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Acting Chairman, Special Committee of 24)

attaches to the Organization's work on decolonization and the need to take all necessary steps to ensure the international community's active participation in the continuation of the decolonization process set forth in the Charter.

Moreover, it has reaffirmed the relevance of the different organs, which for years have spared no effort to achieve that objective and which now, during the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism, proclaimed through resolution 43/47 of 22 November 1988, must be strengthened further.

For this reason, and in my capacity as Acting Chairman of the Special Committee of 24, it is my honour, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce the two draft resolutions contained in documents A/46/L.27 and Corr.1 and A/46/L.28.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Acting Chairman, Special Committee of 24)

I would also like to clarify that Ukraine should not be listed among the sponsors of draft resolution A/46/L.27.

The draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples" (A/46/L.27 and Corr.1) reiterates the general principles and guidelines that should inspire the activities of the international community in its efforts to contribute to the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in those territories that remain subjected to the colonial yoke, so that as soon as possible they may be able fully to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

In adopting this draft resolution, which it is my honour to introduce to the Assembly today, the General Assembly would not only be approving the report of the Special Committee for 1991 and the programme of work of the Special Committee for next year, but would also be recognizing once again that the elimination of colonialism constitutes one of the priorities of the United Nations for this decade - from 1990 to the year 2000.

We attach particular importance to the appeal made in the text to the colonial Powers to cooperate with the work of the Special Committee. Some of them are asked to continue to provide the cooperation that they have traditionally provided. Others are urged to contribute effectively to the work of the Special Committee aimed at fulfilling the mandate given it by this General Assembly and to receive visiting missions of the Committee, which would make it possible for that organ to obtain updated and firsthand information on the wishes and aspirations of the inhabitants of the Territories still under colonial domination.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Acting Chairman, Special Committee of 24)

The second draft resolution, entitled "Dissemination of information on decolonization" (A/46/L.28), reaffirms the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the aims of the Declaration and the role of world public opinion in assisting effectively the peoples of the colonial territories in achieving self-determination and independence.

In accordance with this text, the General Assembly would support increased efforts by the United Nations to ensure the widest possible dissemination of information on decolonization with a view to eliminating colonialism by the year 2000, an undertaking in which the Secretary-General and the relevant organs of the Secretariat would have to play an important role.

On behalf of the members of the Special Committee, I wish to reiterate to the General Assembly the firm determination of that Committee to continue to seek the best way of ensuring the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, taking duly into account the characteristics of each of the Territories.

On behalf of the sponsors, it is my pleasure to submit draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and A/46/L.28 to the General Assembly for its consideration and to request the unanimous and enthusiastic adoption of these texts.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to consider draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and Corr.1 and A/46/L.28.

As regards draft resolution A/46/L.22/Rev.1, which was introduced at the 48th plenary meeting, on 18 November, action on it is postponed until further notice, in order to give the Fifth Committee time to review the programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

(The President)

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. EVANS (United Kingdom): In our statement to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session on this agenda item, my delegation expressed the hope that the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session would not have to consider resolutions and decisions which again failed to reflect realities and which did nothing to advance the wishes of the people of the remaining dependent territories. Draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and A/46/L.28 are ample proof, however, that these hopes, despite the best endeavours of the Permanent Representative of the Congo and those of the Chairman of the Fourth Committee have failed to be realized. That is a matter of great regret to my delegation.

In our statement of 23 October and in my delegation's various explanations of vote and of position in the Fourth Committee, we have made it clear that we remain strongly opposed to the outdated ideas and language which have pervaded, as in previous years, many of the draft resolutions and decisions on the question of decolonization. In particular, we object to the assumption that self-determination should automatically be equated with independence, ignoring the existence of other options, and to references to irrelevant issues such as apartheid and military activities. The two draft resolutions submitted direct to the General Assembly today, as well as the draft resolution in document A/46/L.22/Rev.1, on which action has been postponed, are unacceptable to my delegation for these reasons, and we are therefore unable to support them.

Mr. SIDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The position of the Soviet Union on the question of decolonization and the implementation by peoples of their right to freedom and independence is well known. At the initiative of our country, in 1960, the General Assembly unanimously adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, thanks to which the political face of this planet has been significantly changed. Since there still are in the world almost 20, mostly small, Non-Self-Governing Territories to which the Declaration on decolonization applies, that document continues to play an important role in the activity of the United Nations.

The Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity in the Fourth Committee, in explaining the reasons for its vote on a number of draft resolutions, to state its position concerning wording on the question of nuclear cooperation with South Africa which has clearly become outdated in the light of the fact that South Africa has acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has concluded a safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Unfortunately, despite our efforts, it has not been possible to agree on wording for paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/46/L.27 that would take account of the new realities. In those circumstances, the Soviet delegation proposes, in accordance with rule 89 of the rules of procedure, that a separate vote should be taken on paragraph 9 of that draft resolution. The Soviet delegation will vote against that paragraph. If it is retained, that will be the only reason why we shall be compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/46/L.27 as a whole even though it contains a number of important provisions concerning the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Sidorov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation expresses the hope that in United Nations bodies which deal with problems of decolonization, the aspiration to overcome confrontational stereotypes through joint efforts and to bring this sphere of United Nations activity to a plane of mutually acceptable practical decisions will prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and Corr.1 and A/46/L.28. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications is contained in document A/46/762.

The Assembly will now begin the voting process and vote first on draft resolution A/46/L.27 and Corr.1, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples".

A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. If I hear no objection, I shall put it to the vote first.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Fiji, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Turkey, Uruguay

Paragraph 9 was retained by 105 votes to 34, with 17 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/46/L.27 and Corr.1, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/46/L.27 and Corr.1, as a whole, was adopted by 137 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions (resolution 46/71).

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/46/L.28, entitled "Dissemination of information on decolonization".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Romania

Draft resolution A/46/L.28 was adopted by 143 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions (resolution 46/72).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand): New Zealand has just voted in favour of draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and A/46/L.28 in accordance with its full adherence to the principle of self-determination. We note that the authors of these two resolutions have made some changes from previous years in an effort to make the texts more relevant to contemporary needs. However, New Zealand regrets the continued inclusion in these resolutions of language on matters that are scarcely relevant to the implementation of the Declaration. Paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/46/L.27 is a case in point.

With regard to draft resolution A/46/L.27, on the implementation of the Declaration, New Zealand regrets that the resolution retains what could be regarded as ambiguous language on the activities of foreign economic and other interests in paragraph 7. My delegation commends to the authors of this resolution its own text on foreign economic interests where reference is specifically made to "those" interests, in line with the generally accepted principle that only certain - and by no means all - activities act as an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration.

Mr. GUVEN (Turkey): As one of the sponsors of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Turkey attributes great importance to the successful outcome of the decolonization process. It hopes that before the end of the century the remaining

(Mr. Guven, Turkey)

non-autonomous Territories will be able to exercise their right to self-determination, and is convinced that the end of the cold war will offer new opportunities in this direction.

Turkey also believes that, as in the case of other items on the international agenda, the problems of decolonization require a new approach in line with the changing world. In this context, my delegation is convinced that the draft resolution presented to the Assembly should reflect the new spirit of cooperation and consensus of the United Nations.

In conformity with its long-standing policy of supporting the right to self-determination of peoples under colonial rule, Turkey voted in favour of draft resolution A/46/L.28, on dissemination of information. However, my delegation this year abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/46/L.27, believing that some of its paragraphs do not correspond to the current political realities.

Mr. GRIFFIN (Australia): My delegation has just voted in favour of the draft resolutions under this item contained in documents A/46/L.27 and A/46/L.28, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the dissemination of information on decolonization. These positive votes are a reflection of our strong support for a continuing United Nations role in the decolonization process, particularly as a number of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories are our near neighbours - small island States in the South Pacific. But this United Nations role must be constantly reviewed to ensure that it remains relevant to the unique, and often uniquely difficult, needs and circumstances of the remaining colonial Territories and peoples.

(Mr. Griffin, Australia)

My delegation therefore regrets the maintenance in the draft resolutions just adopted of references which are misplaced and/or anachronistic. Australia urges on the authors of the resolutions under this item next year greater rigour and attentiveness to the needs of the colonial peoples whose progress towards self-determination we are charged to oversee.

The PRESIDENT: We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 19.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.